THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVII OCTOBER, 1942 NO. 4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Humanities and the War — *H. M. Jones & W. G. Rice*	163
Shakspere and Delacroix — *Arnold Whitridge*	167
James I and The Witch—Scenes in *Macbeth* — *Howell V. Calhoun*	184
Imagery in the *Fairie Queene* Based on Domestic and Occupational Life — *Grace W. Landrum*	190
Shakspere on Degree: A Study in Backgrounds — *Paul Deutschberger*	200
Editorial Comment: Shakspere in Cleveland — *S. A. T.*	208

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE HUMANITIES AND THE WAR

An Appeal to All Good Americans

In the emergency now existing, the following propositions must command general assent:

(1) The humanities and humane studies are being put in jeopardy by the present war effort.

(2) The continued existence of the humanities is necessary if proper world organization and an enduring peace—the proper fruits of victory—are to be achieved, and

(3) If the humanities are to be preserved farsighted and decisive action must be immediately taken.

Because the United States is fighting (like its allies) for the right to survive and, surviving, to maintain its own form of civilization, service in or for the armed forces of the republic is inevitably foremost in the thinking of loyal citizens. And because the war is a Titanic battle of machines, one demanding innumerable technical skills, it is natural that government should call upon colleges and universities to train young men and women by hundreds and by thousands for various technical branches of the army, the navy or the flying corps. The colleges and universities have vigorously responded, instituting special curricula, setting aside space and equipment for military or naval uses, gladly lending their faculty members to the government, and thus constituting themselves indispensable adjuncts to existing naval, military and technical training schools. The war is gigantic, and will in all probability be long and costly. The colleges have no desire to refrain from the conflict. Rather, they wish to do their full part.

Nevertheless, the very zeal of these institutions, coupled with the probable truth that the war will be long, raises a serious question as to the purport of higher education in this republic and of its significance to the state. If it be a primary duty of American colleges to do all they can to win the war, it is equally their duty, fundamentally a more important duty, not merely to win the war but also to make the war worth winning, by preserving those elements of a humane and liberal education upon which, in the last analysis, the

existence of the liberal state, the aims and purposes of its life, depend. But unfortunately no responsible body has thus far thought out an answer to the crucial question:

How far can colleges of liberal arts (whether separately established, or parts of universities) become in fact technical schools for training the operatives of highly complex and delicate machines of destruction for the duration of a long and costly struggle, without endangering or obliterating those arts of peace out of which must come a renewed life for the nation and for the world?

It may be said that if the nation falls, the colleges will fall with it; and if the nation survives, the question may be solved after the peace. The dilemma is illusory. We do not admit that the nation will fall; and we hold that the nature of the peace and of our national life thereafter depends in important degree upon the survival of the humane tradition in higher education, if the assumption that the colleges of today educate the citizens of tomorrow has any validity whatsoever.

Although colleges and universities are not the sole guardians of our cultural and social heritage, they are a primary means whereby the inheritance of the traditions of liberal civilization is assured. Perhaps too few Americans realize that this country is one of the last remaining homes of humane education. Over most of the continent of Europe university life has been obliterated by tyranny. Great Britain is a fortress, and the British universities have suffered the fate of the besieged. Throughout the British empire, too, institutions of higher learning are more and more absorbed into the war machine. Whatever may remain of a once great intellectual tradition in unoccupied France and the French empire is dormant or dead. In Japan academic institutions have become instruments of the state; in China they are reduced to skeletons by war; in India they are convulsed by politics. Excellent as are many historic universities to the south of us, they do not have resources at present adequate to the great world problem. Only in the United States is there a possibility of adequately preserving for the duration of the conflict the life and virtues of humane education.

Now no one doubts the necessity for technological military

and naval training in our colleges. But if the life of the liberal college is more and more drained into this endeavor, and if the war and the resultant anarchy are to be long, the logic of this program can scarely prevent the colleges from becoming, as it were, duplicates of the technological schools which our enemies have substituted for the colleges they have destroyed.

A liberal state will not be maintained by a younger generation trained principally as mechanicians and in the arts of war. The instruments of culture cannot safely be left mainly in the hands of the elderly, the incompetent, and the infirm. The aftermath of World War I included a psychological conflict of the generations that did great damage, and a similar conflict after this war will do even greater damage if it is not warded off. Our whole educational system, officered by teachers trained in the liberal arts and nourishing the whole life of the state, depends upon the assumption that a rich, humane, and sturdy intellectual life will always emanate from the colleges and universities. Moreover, the intricate reorganization of our civilian life in war requires skillful leadership that can spring only from a generous concept of man and of the state. Complex as were the post-war problems of the first world conflict, those consequent upon the present strife will be greater; and unless the process of national and international readjustment is carefully directed, disaster must follow. Deeper and more fundamental still is the ancient truth that without vision the people perish. Not merely the science of social life but the very ideal of humanity is at the heart of our struggle. When the spiritual life of the nation is in question, church and school prove their value. Fortunately the life of the church is not now endangered in the same way by urgent military policy as is the life of the humane tradition.

Our enemies gladly kill this tradition wherever they can. In the realm of the mind and soul (and the present war is an ideological conflict) it is their chief enemy. It is, therefore, tragically necessary that there shall not, because of the mechanical nature of the weapons of conflict, be innocently inflicted upon the spiritual life of our country the same serious or mortal wounds our enemies are vengefully anxious to administer. That the values at stake are intangible unfor-

tunately does not mean that they cannot be killed by our own neglect.

Because no responsible body has enunciated an educational policy upon this fundamental and (it may be) tragic issue, we call upon the government and upon educational administrators for an immediate facing of the problem.

To this end the President of the United States should be urged, by educational leaders and friends of the humanities everywhere, to appoint a commission charged with the study of the best means of preserving the life of the liberal colleges as liberal colleges during and after the present struggle.

Among the topics which such a commission might consider are these: the relation of the Selective Service to American undergraduates of whatever age, and the postponement of their induction or exemption from military service in certain specific non-technical categories; the creation of programs of civilian study comparable to the various military and naval training programs now open to undergraduates and carrying, if need be, similar privileges with reference to deferment; the creation also of training centers in the colleges for problems of peace, both technical and general; the institution, where necessary, of new courses in the humanities for all students, whether potential officers or not; the adoption of a policy allowing the deferment of younger teachers which is at least comparable to that already in force with reference to ministers and divinity students; ways and means of financing liberal arts colleges threatened with extinction by the operation of the draft; ways of requiring through the colleges a more widespread understanding of the purpose and ideal of the liberal state, of scholarship, and of the arts as a precious portion of the life of man; and any other mode of maintaining, even in war, and primarily for the welfare of the nation, the life of the humanities in American education.

HOWARD M. JONES
Harvard University

WARNER G. RICE
University of Michigan

SHAKSPERE AND DELACROIX

By ARNOLD WHITRIDGE

WHEN Voltaire announced that Shakspere was a genius without the least spark of good taste,[1] he probably never dreamed that he was lighting a fire of controversy that was to last well over a hundred years—a controversy that extends from Voltaire's guarded admiration for a genius who disgusted and attracted him at the same time down to Victor Hugo's insistence that Shakspere must be worshipped rather than criticized. To the French romantics of the nineteenth century Shakspere was a god who could do no wrong. He was, so Victor Hugo assured his readers, the incarnation of fertility, the foaming cup, the overflowing fountain, the everlasting torrent of life. Racine might be the symbol of taste, of literary decorum, but Shakspere was the symbol of genius, of insensate prodigality. Stendhal's pamphlet, *Racine et Shakespeare,* stated the case in no uncertain terms. Romantic literature (*i.e.,* Shakspere) was that which gives most pleasure to one's contemporaries; classical literature (*i.e.,* Racine) that which gives most pleasure to one's grandparents.

The wave of Shakspere enthusiasm in Paris reached a new high with the appearance of an English company in 1827, including the well-known actors Kemble and Kean and an actress Harriet Smithson, not so well-known then but subsequently famous as the wife of Berlioz. Dumas announced, after seeing this company, that he felt like a man born blind who had suddenly received his sight. "I realized that in the world of the theatre everything emanated from Shakespeare, just as in the real world everything emanates from the sun . . . from that moment my vocation was decided."[2] Only six years before, another English company had been hooted off the stage when it tried to give a performance of Shakspere in Paris. The actors were greeted with cries of 'à bas Shakespeare l'adjutant de Wellington,' and the police had to intervene to protect them from the assaults of the mob. But in those

few years the tide had changed. Shakspere was becoming a mania. In the battle for liberty he was one of the strongest allies of the romantics. His language might not be understood but there was no mistaking the passion of Romeo and Juliet, the torture of Othello or the fury of King Lear. How refreshing it was to see kings and queens swayed by the common passions of humanity. Voltaire had complained that Shakspere's kings were not uniformly kingly.[3] Under the stress of emotion they even talked and acted like other men. For that very reason they were wildly applauded by the irreverent youth of 1830.

Nor was it only the men of letters who were affected. There were others besides Victor Hugo, Dumas and Alfred de Vigny who came to worship at the shrine. The sudden admiration for Elizabethan drama displayed by Hector Berlioz was perhaps not entirely attributable to Shakspere's genius. He had fallen in love with Harriet Smithson, and he had swept her off her feet by threatening to commit suicide if she did not marry him. Unfortunately she did marry him and they both lived to regret it. Berlioz describes in his journal how the sudden and unexpected revelation of Shakspere's genius overwhelmed him.

> "When I left the theatre after seeing *Hamlet,* I was so shaken at what I had experienced that I determined never again to expose myself to the fire of Shakespeare's genius. The next day *Romeo and Juliet* was announced . . . . I had a pass to the orchestra of the Odéon, but so afraid was I that the doorkeeper might have had orders to suspend the free-list, that the moment I saw the advertisement I rushed off to the ticket-office to buy a stall and secure a seat at any cost. From that moment my fate was sealed. After the melancholy, the harrowing sufferings, the tearful love, the bitter irony, the black meditations, the heartrending sorrows, the madness, the tears, mourning, catastrophes, and malign fortune of Hamlet—the dark clouds and icy winds of Denmark—the change was too great to the hot sunshine and balmy nights of Italy—to the love, quick as thought, burning as lava, imperious, irresistible, illimitably pure and beautiful as the smile of an angel; the raging revenges, delirious embraces, and desperate struggles between love and death. And so, at the end of the third act, scarcely able to breathe, stifled with a feeling as though an iron hand held my heart in its grip, I cried out, 'Ah, I am lost!' I must add that I did not then know a syllable of English, that I only dimly discerned Shakespeare through the misty medium of Letourneur's translation, and had no conception of the exquisite poetry in which his wonderful creations were clothed."[4]

The music of Berlioz, of Rossini, of Gounod and of Verdi, is in itself an eloquent commentary on the genius of Shakspere. The tribute of the graphic arts is not so well known but there is at least one painter of the nineteenth century, Eugène Delacroix, whose interest in Shakspere deserves to be remembered. Delacroix was one of the most striking characters in the army of young French romantics who acclaimed Shakspere as the great liberator. Born in 1799, reputedly the son of Talleyrand, his talents and his personal distinction marked him out as the natural leader of the romantic movement in art. He had made a name for himself as a rebel as early as 1822 by a turbulent and dramatic painting, La Barque de Dante, which he exhibited that year in the Salon. Critics at once pointed out how different it was in style from the statuesque perfection of Monsieur Ingres and Monsieur David. They accused him of painting with a drunken broom, but the drunken broom was to prove enormously effective in revitalizing French art.

No one, not even Berlioz, was more enthusiastic about the success of the English company. It was one of their performances that inspired him to write an exultant letter to Victor Hugo about the collapse of "le bon goût."

This Wednesday 1828

> "There has been a general invasion: Hamlet raises his grisly head, Othello sharpens the murderous dagger so subversive of dramatic discipline. Who knows what will happen next? King Lear will tear out his eyes before a French audience. The Academy will probably announce that all such importations are incompatible with public morality. Goodbye to good taste! In any case you had better get yourself a good breastplate to wear under your coat. Beware the daggers of the conservatives, or rather prepare to immolate yourself for the entertainment of all of us barbarians."[5]

He also offered to design the scenery and costumes of *Amy Robsart,* an adaptation of *Kenilworth* by Victor Hugo and his brother-in-law, Paul Foucher. As they grew older Delacroix and Victor Hugo drifted apart. There was not room at the top of the ladder for two such puissant personalities, but at the moment they were united by their common admiration for Shakspere, Byron and Scott. These three and Goethe were the authors who lent themselves most

naturally to illustration. He also painted a number of scenes from *Orlando Furioso,* but Ariosto was so flawless an artist that he was not as paintable as Shakspere or Byron. Apparently Delacroix felt that the nearer a poet approached perfection the less paintable he became.

> "I maintain that it is not usually the greatest poets who lend themselves most readily to the art of the painter: it is the poets who make the most use of description. Profundity of emotion and characterization is not essential. Why is it that Ariosto, in spite of subjects very suitable for painting, inspires the artist much less than Shakespeare or Lord Byron? I believe it is because these two Englishmen, although gifted with an extraordinary wealth of imagination, are often guilty of exaggeration and bombast. Ariosto, on the other hand, confines himself so exclusively to the tools of his own craft, he relies so little on the picturesque or on long drawn out descriptions, that nothing can be eliminated from him. One can take the striking aspect of a character in Shakespeare and add to it according to one's gifts a certain degree of subtlety; but Ariosto! . . ."[6]

Baudelaire was unquestionably right when he described Delacroix as a literary painter. Far from this being a reproach, Baudelaire considered it his crowning glory.

> "Another quality and a very great one in the talent of Monsieur Delacroix, which makes him the painter beloved by poets, is that he is essentially literary. Not only has his painting ranged with invariable success over the field of great literature, not only has he frequented the world of Ariosto, Byron, Dante, Walter Scott and Shakespeare, but also through his painting he has revealed ideas that are nobler, more subtle and more profound than those to be found in the great majority of modern paintings. And notice that it is never by tricks or trivial details that Delacroix achieves his prodigious results; but rather by the total effect, the harmony between his color, his subject, his draughtsmanship, and the dramatic gesture of his figures."[7]

Delacroix transposed literary conceptions into a visual medium and he did it so well that Goethe at least confessed after seeing the illustrations of *Faust* that Delacroix surpassed in intensity anything he had himself imagined.[8]

The list of Delacroix's works classified according to subject contains thirteen titles of paintings drawn from Byron, six from Scott, twelve from Shakspere, and four from Goethe. In addition to the paintings there are the *Hamlet* and the *Faust* lithographs, besides innumerable sketches

and 'projets'. The Shakspere lithographs lack the extraordinarily dramatic quality of the *Faust,* but Mephistopheles lends himself particularly to that 'Wildheit' in Delacroix's genius that Goethe so much admired. The Hamlet is too feminine for our taste. Delacroix is inclined to see him as just another victim of the 'spleen', that convenient Anglo-Saxon complaint to which Frenchmen attributed every English eccentricity. Still, even though his Hamlet suggests the poetic melancholy of Sarah Bernhardt rather than the vigor of the young prince who insists on following his father's ghost, and threatens 'to make a ghost of him that lets me', it is obvious that Delacroix is always penetrated by his subject. His composition is never perfunctory. Compared with Chassériau, another French artist who illustrated Shakspere, Delacroix is the literary painter, whereas Chassériau seems to be exploring the merely decorative possibilities of the subject.

Today the world is inclined to sneer at the literary painter but no sane critic sneers at Delacroix. It is precisely because he possessed the character and the temperament of a man of letters that his art is so interesting. In his *Journal,* he found an outlet for the surplus activities of his abnormally active mind. When he was painting he wrote comparatively little but there were days when painting did not satisfy him and at those times he betook himself to his *Journal.* Few artists have been more articulate about their craft, and though personal tittle-tattle did not interest him unless it was in some way illustrative of general ideas, he covers a wider range of human endeavor than most diarists. Criticism, literary, musical and artistic, bulks large in his *Journal.* Whether or not he was the natural son of Talleyrand, he was like Talleyrand a man of the world, with all the man-of-the-world's dislike of the pedant or the narrow specialist.

Delacroix was more fortunate than many of his fellow painters in that he had visited England and in that he had a circle of English friends. His association with Bonington is well known. He had met him at the Louvre when they were both art students and he had been immediately

attracted by the easy perfection of Bonington's style. It was Bonington who introduced him to the art of water colors which at that time was not practised in France. In 1826 they were sharing a studio together and Delacroix seems to have thoroughly enjoyed the society of his English friend. Apparently Bonington combined a 'sang-froid britannique,' which Delacroix, himself something of a dandy, much admired, with the easy sociability of the Latin Quarter.

Among his other English friends were the four Fielding brothers, all of them painters and one of them, Copley Fielding, a water colorist of real distinction. In the early pages of the *Journal* there are repeated references to his dining with the Fieldings and adjourning with them afterwards to the English brewery to drink gin and water.

Delacroix's trip to England was very largely the result of his friendship with Bonington and the Fieldings, but they were not the only factors. Another reason for going to England was to study the paintings of Constable, who had developed a technique which was to revolutionize French painting and to open the way to Impressionism. Constable's 'Haywain', now in the National Gallery in London, had been exhibited in the Salon in 1824 where it had caused something of a furor. A picture by Constable, "c'est de l'eau, de l'air et du ciel". Such was the verdict of Charles Nodier,[9] one of the first Frenchmen to fall under Constable's spell. Delacroix was no less enthusiastic. 'Ce Constable', says Delacroix, 'me fait un grand bien'. So impressed was he by the 'Haywain' that he repainted one of his most famous pictures, 'The Massacre of Scio,' in accordance with Constable's principle. In the *Journal* he explains the principle very precisely. Constable had discovered that in Nature a color which appears uniform is actually composed of a variety of tints.[10] Thus the freshness of the grass in the 'Haywain' was produced by a myriad shades of green, and it was this liveliness of color that Delacroix set himself to imitate.

For once French artists were looking across the Channel for inspiration. Géricault writes to Horace Vernet that

only one thing was lacking in his talent, that he had not steeped himself in the English school. Not to submit to the influence of Constable and Old Crome and Bonington was to brand oneself a hopeless reactionary. In painting, as in English poetry, England was leading the way.

Delacroix missed Constable in London but he met a number of other artists, including Wilkie and Sir Thomas Lawrence, who seem to have greeted him with charming courtesy. He admired them both, particularly Lawrence, and more than a trace of Lawrence's aristocratic distinction may be seen in the few portraits that he himself painted. Altogether Delacroix spent only a few months in England and for our knowledge of his impressions we are dependent on a half dozen letters. His comments are not by any means uniformly favorable. Like many other travellers he did not like the climate, he was oppressed by the ugliness of the architecture, and he was irritated (as he admitted) by manners and customs he did not understand. Though he flattered himself upon his cosmopolitan tastes, no sooner had he left the shores of France than he became afflicted with acute nostalgia. The Fielding brothers took him on expeditions up the Thames and evidently did their best to amuse him but Delacroix did not transplant easily. His tributes to England are therefore all the more remarkable because they were not dictated by any spirit of facile enthusiasm. His visit ripened him artistically and intellectually; it confirmed his admiration for English contempory art and it opened his eyes to Shakspere. Towards the end of his life he paid a magnificent tribute to the vitality of English painting. "Notre école est vieille et il semble que l'école anglaise soit jeune. Ils semblent chercher le naturel et nous ne sommes occupés qu'à imiter des tableaux."[11] The visit to England enabled him to see the best productions of Shakspere that the early nineteenth century could offer. He was particularly enthusiastic about the acting of Charles Kean.

> "I saw Richard III acted by Kean, who is a very great actor, . . . The beginning of the play was changed: instead of the death of Clarence they began with the death of Henry VI, who also comes into Shakespeare in *Henry VI, part 2.* Richard, who is still only

> Gloster [*sic*] enters the prison and assassinates him. This scene was very dramatically played by Kean, as well as many others which I shall not fail to regale you with. I have also seen him in Othello. Words fail me to describe the genius of a man who can conceive such characters as Othello and Iago."[12]

These performances may not have been exactly in the tradition of the Globe Theatre but at least they were nearer to the original Shakspere than the emasculated adaptations offered by the Comédie Française. When the English company came to Paris Delacroix was one of the few who had already been inoculated by the Shakspere virus. His comments on Shakspere, unlike the headlong enthusiasm of Victor Hugo, were inspired by an effort to understand dramatic problems. For Victor Hugo Shakspere was the Mississippi or the Niagara Falls of literature.[13] Whether you like these forces of Nature or not is beside the point. The man of imagination contemplates them with awe, and those who get in their way are inevitably swept aside.

Delacroix approached Shakspere from a different point of view. He wanted not so much to praise or to blame as to understand. The indiscriminate adoration of youth gave way to the searching curiosity of a mature mind. The *Journal* contains forty-seven separate references to Shakspere, some of which are merely casual allusions, but for the most part whenever Delacroix mentions Shakspere he likes to spread himself across the page. He is forever asking himself questions. How does it happen that Shakspere and Beethoven open up vistas to the imagination that the more perfect artists like Racine and Mozart do not? What impression did Shakspere make upon Elizabethan audiences, and does he make the same impression today? How far does he cater to an exclusively English taste? Is he not sometimes wearisome even to those who understand every nuance of the language? These and a hundred other questions are forever surging through his mind.

The *Journal* itself has been accurately described as a "monument de l'art français."[14]

Other journals present a more vivid pageant of the period. Delacroix gives us the inner life of the artist, his ideas rather than his achievements, his unceasing study, his

restless intelligence. It is the record of a man who fought all his life for artistic independence. His contemporaries considered him the chief of the romantic school, and if by a romantic is meant one who is not interested in painting statuesque scenes of the battle of Marathon then he deserved the name. Actually Delacroix was completely out of sympathy with a great many of the things that the word romanticism suggests. An anecdote of the salons reveals the strange contrast between the revolutionary character of his painting and his extremely conservative taste in literature. One evening Delacroix happened to be at a reception given by two English ladies. Among the other guests was Victor Hugo, with whom Delacroix entered into an argument about Voltaire. Much to Hugo's surprise Delacroix insisted on the exquisite beauty of *Tancred*. One of the English ladies who happened to share his admiration for Voltaire was heard to exclaim, "What a delightful person M. Delacroix is, and how witty, but what a pity that he paints." Many of those who so admired his painting would have been surprised to know that he preferred Voltaire to Victor Hugo just as he preferred the music of Mozart to that of Berlioz. He respects 'le bon sens' and 'le sentiment du devoir'. Indeed, he picks out as one of the serious flaws in the French character the absence of a sense of duty.

> ". . . one of the great weaknesses of the French character, the one which has contributed perhaps more than any other to the catastrophes in which our history abounds, is the absence among all classes of the sentiment of duty . . . Among the English, on the contrary, who as a people are not so susceptible to distraction, the sense of duty is felt by everybody."[15]

His taste had been formed by Voltaire rather than by Victor Hugo, and he has a predilection for the compactness of Voltaire's novels or Montaigne's *Essays,* books which do not weary the reader any more than they wearied the author. The lachrymose sentimentality of modern literature disgusts him. The desperately picturesque histories of Thiers, the novels of Dickens and George Sand, offend him by their constant appeal to the reader for sympathy. Nor were these his only reasons for disliking modern literature and modern painting. He traces the inferiority of modern literature to the desire to say everything. The ensemble

disappears swamped in details, and the result for the reader is an intolerable sense of ennui.[16] For the same reason, though he admits the vigor of Courbet's painting, he can never like him. There is too much detail in Courbet and too little significance in the detail.

Now these are not the sentiments of a good romantic.[17] How was it that Delacroix, in spite of his impatience with so many of the current tendencies in art, should still apparently have shared that admiration for Shakspere which was commonly regarded as the touchstone of the new order? The *Journal* itself suggests an answer to this apparent inconsistency. The manuscript consisting of a number of notebooks, is divided into two unequal parts, the journal of his youth covering only two years, 1822-1824, and the journal of the mature man, which extends from 1847 to 1863. Of the intervening period there is no record. Either he was too busy painting to find time for a journal or else the notebooks have been lost. Delacroix mentions leaving the 1848 notebook in a fiacre and never recovering it.

The early journal unfortunately does not cover the visit to England, so that all that we know about his first impressions of Shakspere come from the letters already quoted. The record of these early years reveals the young romantic full of ardor describing his artistic enthusiasms and his amorous adventures with the same gusto. We glean something about his discovery of Géricault and Constable and of his friendship for the Fieldings, but there is nothing particularly unusual about the two years. Like many other young men, he was burning with ambition, contemptuous of mediocrity, wondering just how and when he was going to distinguish himself. Shakspere is hardly mentioned, but he has been reading a good deal of Byron—he mentions explaining Childe Harold to his aunt—and Godwin, whom everybody else was reading, and the now forgotten Robert Maturin. Subjects for pictures thronged his mind. Dante is full of paintable subjects and so is Byron, but for the moment he is not attracted by Shakspere. It was only as he grew older that he began to think that *Hamlet* might lend itself to illustration just as well as the *Bride of Abydos* or *Don Juan*. In 1843 he executed a series of thirteen litho-

graphs from *Hamlet* but they did not meet with as much success as the *Faust* lithographs he had made fifteen years earlier. His paintings of Shakspere, which include scenes from *Hamlet, Othello,* and *Romeo and Juliet,* date from 1847 to 1860.

During all these years Delacroix was not only recreating Shakspere on canvas but wrestling with him in spirit. He has discarded the idea that Shakspere was an inspired barbarian. On the contrary, he was 'très raffiné,' but his genius was so completely foreign that he finds it terribly difficult to lay his mind alongside of him. Shakspere may do well enough in England but he will never make a lasting impression in France, for a nation can appreciate only those things in which it has itself achieved a success. France has established certain canons of art which the civilized world has accepted, and yet the greatness of Shakspere, of Michael Angelo, of Beethoven, lies in their transcending those universally accepted canons. A Frenchman is baffled when he attempts to judge them. They are like some great oak, the branches of which are gnarled and misshapen and yet the whole effect of the tree is marvellously harmonious. Perfect beauty should imply perfect simplicity, but perfect simplicity in music, in literature or in painting does not compel the attention. Delacroix is forced to admit to himself that there is a peculiar vitality, a secret force in Shakpere's very imperfections to which the ordered masterpieces of Racine and Mozart never attain.

Voltaire admitted as much when he said that the English poetic genius was like a vigorous tree thrusting its branches in all directions, which would die as soon as it was clipped and pleached like the trees in the gardens of Marly. Where Delacroix differed from Voltaire was in his willingness to see the value of a form of art from which he instinctively recoiled. No doubt he had learned a good deal about Shakspere from his friend Philarète Chasles. Chasles was one of the first of that distinguished band of French scholars including Guizot, Taine and Emile Montégut, who undertook to expound English literature to their countrymen. He and Delacroix had been at school together, and

though Delacroix had certain reserves about him as a friend he had great respect for him as a critic.

It was Chasles who pointed out to him that Shakspere had created individuals rather than types. The discovery may not seem to us very arresting but it enabled Delacroix to surmount a difficulty that had been troubling French critics for over a hundred years. Shakspere was perhaps justified in making Hamlet engage in buffooneries with the gravediggers, provided it was clearly understood that Hamlet was not intended to be a typical Danish prince. There are certain things that princes of the royal blood can not do, at least not on the French stage, but obviously Shakspere did not conceive of Hamlet as a Danish prince at all. Delacroix was ready enough to admit that Shakspere's eccentricities were justified by their success but he never admitted for a moment that the theatre of Racine had thereby been outmoded. The efforts of his friend Dumas to follow in Shakspere's footsteps convinced him that Shakspere was inimitable. Only the faults could be imitated.

Delacroix saw, as Victor Hugo did not, that French dramatists were groping in a blind alley. The classicists could not deny that plays written on the model of Corneille and Racine left the spectator unmoved. Even supposing that these plays were technically perfect still they were lifeless. Equally lifeless, though the romantics did not know it, were the attempts to imitate Shakspere's careless profusion. Shakspere was apparently one of those wines that do not bear transportation. His merits and his defects were peculiarly English. An English audience was no more capable of understanding his faults today than an Elizabethan audience had been, indeed, the Elizabethans were probably charmed by the very things that would shock a nineteenth-century playgoer. The exquisite passages in Shakspere were not what delighted the sailors and fishmongers who frequented the Globe, and there was no reason to suppose that the gallants of Elizabeth's court were any more sensitive. No doubt they infinitely preferred the puns and conceits to the lyrical passages so much admired by romantic critics.[18] Opinions such as these indicate that Delacroix,

much as he admired Shakspere, was perfectly ready to swim against the current of adoration.

A few years before his death, Robert Bridges, the poet laureate, wrote an essay on the influence of the audienc on Shakspere's drama, in the course of which he maintained[19] that if we could have been present at a first performance of his plays, to witness what parts of them were applauded, and what parts were not duly appreciated, we should understand why they were written as they are. Delacroix anticipated Bridges in pointing out how dependent Shakspere was upon his audience, but he was not content to leave it at that. He insists that a playwright has not finished his task when he has produced a play that captivates the audience. It must also stand the very difficult test of reading, and he finds Shakspere much too ready to overlook this further obligation to the public.

Voltaire had already proved, to his own satisfaction, that Racine was necessarily a greater playwright than Shakspere becuse he had succeeded in pleasing a far more critical audience. Now we find Delacroix uniting the criticism of Voltaire and Robert Bridges. The truly great artist must contrive to please the million without sacrificing the good opinion of the scholar or the man of the world. In his opinion Shakspere did not meet this supreme test any more, he might have added, than did Racine.

Whether we agree with Delacroix or not, he must be given credit for extending the field of Shakspere criticism in France. Instead of the usual gambit, genius *vs.* taste, he offers a new opening. He admits that Shakspere is a genius, though his genius is very different from that of Racine, which he as a Frenchman finds far more comprehensible, but he wonders whether Shakspere's curious technique, his emphasis on action rather than on eloquence, does not result in one very important advantage. The crowded action of a Shakspere play prevents the dramatist from interjecting himself between the audience and the stage. In Delacroix's eyes the artist, whether he were a painter, a poet or a musician, who came before the public pleading for sympathy, had committed the unpardonable sin.[20]

Throughout all his Shakspere criticism Delacroix reveals himself as one of the first French critics to have made a serious effort to get his own nationality out of the way. As a young man he had been imbued with the current enthusiasm for Shakspere as the apostle of æsthetic liberty, but as he grew older the truculent enthusiasm of youth gave way to a more mature spirit of analysis. He ignored the popular controversy, romanticism *vs.* classicism, realizing that it did not meet the issue. With some difficulty he rid himself of the Voltairean fallacy that the sublime was synonymous with perfection instead of being merely one expression of it, nor did he fall into the opposite error of thinking that perfection must include an element of the grotesque. Just what he meant by perfection is suggested by his criticism of the great actress La Malibran:

> "One of the proofs given of her talent was that she never knew how she was going to act a given scene . . . Sometimes she was very effective and gave a genuinely powerful performance, At other times she overplayed her part disgracefully and was almost unbearable. I never remember seeing her 'noble'. When she came nearest to being sublime it was never anything but what a bourgeoise could accomplish; in a word, she was completely lacking in any sense of the ideal."[21]

Delacroix always had a horror of the conception of art as a sort of care-free rapture. He brought to the study of Shakspere not only the most fertile imagination of his epoch but also a very real knowledge of literature, music and painting. Not the least illuminating passages in the *Journal* are those interpretations of Shakspere and Racine in the light of music and painting. Long before the Symbolists Delacroix may be said to have scrambled the arts. He loved the apparently easy perfection of Mozart, Raphael and Racine, but his love did not blind him to the Titanic quality of Michael Angelo, Shakspere and Beethoven.

His *Journal* stands as the most effective refutation of the theory popular in his lifetime that any man who could paint such pictures as 'The Massacre of Scio' must be afflicted with a disordered mind. On the contrary, he was a man of unusually sober judgment. By temperament a sceptic and an aristocrat, much more sympathetic with the ideals of the eighteenth than of the nineteenth century, he

came to admire Shakspere almost against his will. As a young man he had flung his cap for Shakspere and liberty but as he grew older the Shaksperian qualities that had attracted his generation, qualities incidentally that he himself possessed—energy, fecundity and a turbulent imagination—seem to have lost their attraction for him. The only artist of his time whom he thought really sure of immortality was Meissonier, whose vivid little pictures possessed a superficial brilliance he felt himself unable to attain. All the more remarkable is it that Shakspere should have played such an important part in his artistic life. At the end of the year 1860, more than thirty years after he had first seen Shakspere acted by Kean and Macready, he was planning to paint an elaborate series of pictures based on scenes from *Romeo and Juliet*. The time-worn discussions about Shakspere's lack of taste, his irregularities, his dangerous mixture of the comic and tragic, had long since been forgotten. What remained was a passion for painting and a conviction that Shakspere, Byron and Scott, but particularly Shakspere, offered him the subjects he needed. No one has ever excelled him in the art of translating words into paint. That is Delacroix's real contribution to our understanding of Shakspere. He was in a most literal sense a creative critic. While other men busied themselves pointing out Shakspere's felicities of language, his dramatic instinct, or his criticism of life, Delacroix has gone to work to recreate Shakspere's men and women in another medium.

Calhoun College, Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

[1]Voltaire, *Lettres Philosophiques*, no. 18.

[2]"Je lux, je dévorai le théâtre étranger, et je reconnus que dans le monde théâtral tout émanait de Shakespeare, comme dans le monde réel tout émane du soleil; que nul ne pouvait lui être comparé, car il était aussi dramatique que Corneille, aussi comique que Molière, aussi original que Calderon, aussi penseur que Goethe, aussi passionné que Schiller. Je reconnus que ses ouvrages, à lui seul, renfermaient autant de types que les ouvrages de tous les autres réunis. Enfin, je reconnus que c'était l'homme qui avait le plus créé après Dieu." Comment Je Devins Auteur Dramatique by Alexandre Dumas. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1833.

[3]See the article on Art Dramatique in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique* in which Voltaire replies to the criticisms Dr. Johnson had passed upon him in the celebrated 'Preface to Shakespeare'.

[4]*Memoirs of Hector Berlioz*, annotated and edited by Ernest Newman (New York, 1932), pp. 68, 69.

[5]"Eh bien! Envahissement général: Hamlet lève sa tête hideuse, Othello prépare

son poignard essentiellement occiseur et subversif de toute bonne police dramatique. Qui sait encore? Le roi Lear va s'arracher les yeux devant un public français. Il serait de la dignité de l'Académie de déclarer incompatible avec la moralité publique toute importation de ce genre. Adieu le bon goût!

Apprêtez-vous, dans tous les cas, une bonne cuirasse sous votre habit. Craignez les poignards classiques, ou plutôt immolez-vous courageusement pour nos plaisirs, à nous autres, barbares . . ." *Delacroix,* by Raymond Escholier (Paris, 1926), vol. 1, p. 190.

[6]"J'établis que, en général, ce ne sont pas les plus grands poètes qui prêtent le plus à la peinture; ceux qui y prêtent le plus sont ceux qui donnent une plus grande place aux descriptions. La vérité des passions et du caractère n'y est pas nécessaire. Pourquoi l'Arioste, malgré des sujets très propres à la peinture, incite-t-il moins que Shakespeare et lord Byron, par exemple, à représenter en peinture ses sujets? Je crois que c'est, d'une part, parce que les deux Anglais, bien qu'avec quelques traits principaux qui sont frappants pour l'imagination, sont souvent ampoulés et boursouflés. L'Arioste, au contraire, peint tellement avec les moyens de son art, il abuse si peu du pittoresque, de la description interminable qu'on ne peut rien lui dérober. On peut prendre d'un personnage de Shakespeare l'effet frappant, l'espèce de vérité pittoresque de son personnage, et y ajouter, suivant ses facultés, un certain degré de finesse; mais l'Arioste! . . . . " Journal de Eugène Delacroix. 3 vols. Edited by André Joubin. Paris 1932. Vol. III, p. 450. This Journal was originally published in 1893 but the authoritative edition is that of André Joubin to whom all students of Delacroix are deeply indebted. An abridged translation of this edition by Walter Pach was published by Coriti Friese (New York, 1937).

[7]"Une autre qualité, très grande, très vaste, du talent de M. Delacroix, et qui fait de lui le Peintre aimé des poëtes, c'est qu'il est essentiellement littéraire. Non, seulement sa peinture a parcouru, toujours avec succès, le champ des hautes littératures, non seulement elle a traduit, elle a fréquenté Arioste, Byron, Dante, Walter Scott, Shakspeare, mais elle sait réveler des idées d'un ordre plus élevé, plus fines, plus profondes que la plupart des peintures modernes. Et remarquez bien que ce n'est jamais par la grimace, par la minutie, par la tricherie de moyens, que M. Delacroix arrive à ce prodigieux résultat; mais par l'ensemble, pal l'accord profond, complet, entre sa couleur, son sujet, son dessin, et par la dramatique gesticulation de ses figures." *Curiosités Esthétiques, Páris.* 1868. Reprinted in vol. V. of the *Oeuvres Complètes.* Baudelaire was one of Delacroix's earliest and most persistent champions.

[8]"Herr Delacroix, sagte Goethe, ist ein grosses Talent, das gerade am Faust die rechte Nahrung gefunden hat. Die Franzosen tadeln an ihm seine Wildheit, allein hier kommt sie ihm recht zu Statten. . . . Ich machte bemerklich, das solche Bilder zum besseren Verstehen des Gedichts sehr viel beitrügen. Das ist keine Frage, sagte Goethe, denn die vollkommnere Einbildungskraft eines solchen Künstlers zwingt uns, die Situationen go gut zu denken, wie er sie selber gedacht hat. Und wenn ich nun gestehen muss, das Herr Delacroix meine eigene Vorstellung bei Scenen übertroffen hat, die ich selber gemacht habe, um wie viel mehr werden nicht die Leser alles lebendig und über ihre Imagination hinausgehend finden!" Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe,* Nov. 29, 1826.

[9]Charles Nodier, *Promenade de Dieppe aux Montagnes d'Ecosse.*

[10]"Constable dit que la supériorité du vert de ses prairies tient à ce qu'il est composé d'une multitude de verts différents. Ce qui donne le défaut d'intensité et de vie à la verdure du commun des paysagistes, c'est qu'ils la font ordinairement d'une teinte uniforme.

Ce qu'il dit ici du vert des prairies, peut s'appliquer à tous les autres tons." Joubin III, p. 451.

[11]*Lettres de Eugène Delacroix,* ed. by Philippe Burty (Paris, 1880) vol. II, p. 194. Delacroix's estimate of the importance of the English School in this particular period of French art is corroborated by Prosper Dorbec in his 'L'Art du Paysage en France' (Paris, 1925).

[12]"J'ai vu Richard III, joué par Kean, qui est un très-grand acteur. . . . Young ne me plait pas autant. Je l'ai vu dans plusieurs pièces, entre autres dans la *Tempête,* qu'on a remise à la scène. On a changé le commencement de Richard: au lieu de la mort de Clarence, ils ont mis la mort de Henri VI, qui est aussi de Shakespeare, mais dans la deuxième partie d'Henri VI. Richard, qui n'est encore que Gloster (sic), vient dans

sa prison et l'assassine à coups d'épée. Ce moment a été terriblement rendu par Kean, ainsi que mille autres dont je ne manquerai pas de te rebattre les oreilles. J'ai vu aussi Othello par lui. Les expressions d'admiration manquent pour le génie de Shakespeare qui a inventé Othello et Iago." Burty I, p. 105.

[13]*William Shakespeare.* By Victor Hugo. 1864. See particularly the chapters on Shakspere's genius, but the whole book is dithyrambic in tone.

[14]A. Joubin. I, p. xix.

[15]A. Joubin. II, p. 26.

[16]A. Joubin. III, p. 233.

[17]Delacroix's impatience with certain aspects of romanticism is clearly indicated in a letter to Sainte-Beuve, August 12, 1862. ". . . Ne vous lassez pas, cher et ancien compagnon de guerre: continuez vigoureusement à prouver (et j'en serai charmé de ma part) qu'on peut être romantique et avoir du bon sens et de l'élévation." Burty, II, p. 314.

[18]A. Joubin. III, p. 176.

[19]Robert Bridges. *The influence of the Audience on Shakespeare's Drama,* Oxford, 1927.

[20]"Style moderne (en littérature). Le style moderne est mauvais. Abus de la sentimentalité, du pittoresque à propos de tout. Si un amiral raconte des campagnes de mer, il le fait dans un style de romancier et presque d'humanitaire. On allonge tout, on poétise tout. On veut paraitre ému, pénétré, et l'on croit à tort que ce dithyrambe perpétuel gagnera l'esprit du lecteur et lui donnera une grande idée de l'auteur et surtout de la bonté de son coeur." A. Joubin. III, p. 54.

[21]A. Joubin. I, p. 174.

JAMES I AND THE WITCH SCENES IN *MACBETH*

By HOWELL V. CALHOUN

JAMES VI of Scotland, who in his later years became James I of England, grew up in a country that was addicted to superstition and a belief in witchcraft. Moreover, Scottish witchcraft was closer to that current on the Continent than was the English. Continental witchcraft had been formalized, partly through the influence of the Church, which identified it with the Gnostic and Manichaean heresies, into an elaborate demonical science, with ceremonial worship of the Evil One, regular meetings or "Sabbats" to pay homage and indulge in Saturnalian orgies, and the exercise of elaborate evil powers on the part of the devotees of the cult. English witchcraft, on the other hand, was a very homely and primitive affair by comparison, having its roots mainly in the domestic life of the lower classes, and showing no trace of the Sabbat or other exotic Continental features.

James had firsthand experience with the malign activity of witches, and he left a careful record of it in his pamphlet *Newes From Scotland declaring the damnable life and death of Doctor Fian, a notable Sorcerer,* which appeared in 1591. The whole affair hinged about the evil activities of Dr. Fian (alias Iohn Cunningham), Agnis Sampson, and the North Berwick witches, in their attempt to destroy the ship on which James was returning from Denmark with his bride. Agnis Sampson and Fian were subjected to the most unspeakable tortures, to facilitate their confessions. Agnis's head was wrenched with a rope, pilliwinks were laid on her fingers, Fian's fingernails were pulled out with pincers, and pins inserted to the heads beneath what was left of them. Not content with these brutalities, the torturers crushed both Fian's legs in iron boots until "the bloud and marrowe sprouted forth in great abundance, whereby they were made unseruicable for ever".[1] In the light of these circumstances, the weird story that was patched together from the various confessions is not surprising. Agnis, for example, affirmed that when the king was in Denmark she and the

other witches took a cat, christened it, and bound portions of a dead man's body to it. Later they threw this cat into the sea, and this was supposedly the reason why James encountered a storm on his trip home from Denmark.

James's classic work, the *Daemonologie,* first appeared in Scotland in 1597, but it was not published in England until 1603. In this work James allies himself with Bodin and those authorities who believed fully in the malign and supernatural nature of witchcraft. The book is divided into three parts. The first takes up the subject of magic and necromancy, the second treats of witchcraft and sorcery, and the third discourses of all kinds of spirits and spectres. The king's intention in this work was to prove two things, "the one, that such diuelish artes haue bene and are," and the other, "what exact trial and seuere punishment they merite".[2] James betrays a singular gullibility with respect to the diabolical powers attributed to witches, and says definitely that they "ought to be put to death according to the Law of God, the ciuill and imperial law, and municipall law of all Christian nations."[3] This treatise, coming as it did from the hand of the most powerful figure in the kingdom, was bound to counteract the effect that the work of a liberal thinker like Reginald Scot[4] had made upon the popular mind. James's work is a statement of personal beliefs, rather than a scholarly study of the subject, and consequently was respected in that light by all those who sought to ingratiate themselves into the favor of the king.

Shakspere's use of many elements of Scottish and Continental witchlore in *Macbeth* may be attributed to no other influence than that exercised by King James's two publications mentioned above. In the first place, there is the presentation of a Sabbat in Scene iv of Act II, with the boiling of a foul brew, and the conjuring up of evil spirits to prophesy Macbeth's future. Ceremonial dancing was a feature usually associated with the Sabbat, and this is reflected in the witches' dance and song:

> The weird sisters, hand in hand,
> Posters of the sea and land
> Thus do go about, about . . .

The brew that the witches concoct is rather interesting. The

evil ingredients that go to make it up were well known in the annals of witchlore:

> Adam de Stratton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, the most infamous of extortioners and false stewards in English annals, was arrested and tried in 1289 and 1290. Infinite treasure was found in his possession. There was also seized among his chattels, we are told, a coffer or silk bag containing parings of nails, human hair, the feet of toads and moles, and other "diabolical things."[5]

In four of the elements of the brew, however, there is visible a reflection of James's law against witchcraft, enacted in 1604, which forbade the taking of "the skin bone or any other parte of any dead person" to be used in witchcraft.[6] This, incidentally, was probably due to the fact that Angis Sampson, implicated in the trial of Dr. Fian, confessed that she had used "the cheefest partes of a dead man, and seuerall ioynts of his bodie" in raising the storm that nearly destroyed James's ship.[7]

In this way we may explain Shakspere's listing as ingredients "poison'd entrails", the "liver of blaspheming Jew", the "nose of Turk and Tartar's lips", as well as the "finger of birth-strangled babe". The latter item has a double significance, since Continental witches continually made use of the bodies of unbaptized babies in their incantations, and a baby strangled at birth obviously could not have received the sacrament of baptism. At other points in the play, also, there is mention of the witches' employing "grease that's sweaten from the murderer's gibbet", and a "pilot's thumb". Another item in the brew, the

> Toad, that under cold stone
> Days and nights has thirty-one
> Swelt'red venom sleeping got . . .

is interesting because of the fact that Agnis Sampson also confessed that she

> . . . tooke a blacke Toade, and did hang the same up by the heeles, three daies, and collected and gathered the venome as it dropped and fell from it in an Oister shell . . .[8]

She intended to place this venom upon a piece of linen belonging to the king, and in this manner bewitch him to death. Indeed, Shakspere's choosing of a cat and toad as familiars (Graymalkin and Paddock) might perhaps be traced to the fact that this toad and a christened cat played so prominent a part in the trial of Agnis and Dr. Fian.

The witches' flying to and from the Sabbat was a common Scottish and Continental notion. Their habit of flight is reflected in Macbeth's curse, "Infected be the air whereon they ride . . .", and in the sudden disappearance of the witches after their first meeting with Macbeth and Banquo. King James in the *Daemonologie* had stated that witches were often invisible while riding through the air:

> . . . in this transporting they say themselues, that they are inuisible to anie other, except among themselues; which may also be possible in my opinion.[9]

This would explain their vanishing so abruptly, noted by Banquo in the following words:

> The earth hath bubbles, as the water has,
> And these are of them. Whither are they vanish'd?

Macbeth answers:

> Into the air, and what seem'd corporal melted
> As breath into the wind . . .

The witches' unusual power over the weather also can be traced back to some elements in Dr. Fian's trial. The opening lines of the play,

> When shall we three meet again
> In thunder, lightning, or in rain?

and the witches' cry "Hover through the fog and filthy air," show their close connection with the elements. Macbeth, evidently having witnessed the storm raised by the witches, says, "So foul and fair a day I have not seen," and when the First Witch says she will set out to punish the sailor whose wife had refused her chestnuts, the Second answers: "I'll give thee a wind." The First then replies:

> Though his bark cannot be lost,
> Yet it shall be tempest-tost . . .

Macbeth, again, when he comes to consult the witches in Act IV, refers to their power to

> . . . untie the winds and let them fight
> Against the churches . . .

and their ability to make

> . . . the yesty waves
> Confound and swallow navigation up . . .

All of this may be explained by the fact that, although power to influence the elements was often ascribed to English

witches, it had figured even more largely in the North Berwick witches' attempt on James's life. They supposedly raised a great tempest to beset his ship as it returned from Denmark, with the result that

> . . . when the rest of the Shippes had a faire and good winde, then was the winde contrarye and altogither against his Maiestie: and further the saide witche declared, that his Maiestie had neuer come safely from the Sea, if his faith had not preuailed aboue their ententions.[10]

Another echo of this incident is the First Witch's statement:

> But in a sieve I'll thither sail,
> And, like a rat without a tail,
> I'll do, I'll do, and I'll do.

Though Scot had affirmed that witches could "saile in an egge shell, a cockle or muscle shell, through and under the Tempestuous Seas,"[11] this passage is probably an allusion to the fact that Angis Sampson confessed

> . . . that upon the night of Allhollon Euen last, she was accompanied aswell with the persons aforesaide, as also with a great many other witches, to the number of two hundreth: and that all they together went by Sea each one in a Riddle or Ciue, and went in the same very substantially with Flaggons of wine making merrie and drinking by the waye in the same Riddles or Ciues, to the Kerke of North Barrick in Lowthian . . .[12]

One other point in the play also merits notice in this regard. This is the appearance of an apparition in the shape of an "armed Head", which warns Macbeth to beware Macduff. James told Sir John Harrington in 1604 that

> . . . (the Queene his mother's death) was visible in Scotlande before it did really happen, being, as he said, spoken of in secrete by those whose power of sight presentede to them a bloodie head dancing in the aire[13]

Shakspere, in presenting an "armed Head" and a "bloody Child" may possibly have had this in mind.

Whatever Shakspere's indebtedness to James for specific references and allusions in the play may have been, however, it is certain that the spirit and atmosphere were deliberately designed to appeal to the monarch's tastes and opinions on the subject of witchcraft.

625 *Riverside Drive,*
New York, N. Y.

[1]King James the First, *Newes From Scotland declaring the damnable life and death of Doctor Fian, a notable Sorcerer,* edited by G. B. Harrison, Bodley Head Quartos, New York, 1924, p. 28.

[2]King James the First, *Daemonologie,* edited by G. B. Harrison, Bodley Head Quartos, New York, 1924, p. xii.

[3]*Ibid.,* p. 77.

[4]Scot's most famous work, the *Discoverie of Witchcraft,* which appeared in 1584, was an extremely enlightened work, and sought to ridicule most of the popular superstitious beliefs concerning witchcraft.

[5]George Lyman Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England,* Cambridge, 1929, p. 48.

[6]This law is reprinted in full in C. L'Estrange Ewen, *Witch Hunting and Witch Trials,* New York, 1929, pp. 16-18.

[7]King James the First, *Newes From Scotland,* pp. 16-18.

[8]King James the First, *Newes From Scotland,* p. 16.

[9]King James the First, *Daemonologie,* pp. 38-39.

[10]King James the First, *Newes From Scotland,* p. 17.

[11]Reginald Scot, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft,* edited by Brinsley Nicholson, London, 1886, p. 8.

[12]King James the First, *Newes From Scotland,* p. 13.

[13]Cited in *Shakespeare's England,* Oxford, 1916, I, 540.

IMAGERY IN THE *FAERIE QUEENE* BASED ON DOMESTIC AND OCCUPATIONAL LIFE

By GRACE W. LANDRUM

THE following study adds nothing to the history of Elizabethan social life. It would have been greatly extended had it attempted to show the whole local habitation of the great fairyland which is both Renaissance and medieval. I have omitted lines and passages of beauty and significance if they made only literal mention of scenes, objects, and sounds. My purpose has been merely to show a tremendous imagination stirred by the round of normal living to expression in figurative language. I have left out also imagery arising from the "fierce warres" with which the whole poem rings. Conflict as dominant in Spenser has had abundant mention.[1] A recent treatment has reiterated Spenser's exaltation of the military life.[2] Furthermore, to prevent the overlapping of material in my previous studies of Spenser's imagery,[3] I have omitted certain activities, for instance, agriculture and seafaring. This study, thus limited, treats imagery from the life of man as the denizen of a comparatively peaceful earth.

Though non-military life is our concern, it will be impossible to ignore figures based on structures for defense among which all urban and many rural Elizabethans necessarily lived. The poet's environment, except perhaps during the years at Cambridge, includes many "bricky" or stone towers built against assailants. Tradition has it that he was reared not far from the great Tower in his fairest Cleopolis.[4] Abundant, compelling imagery derives from castle, fort, bulwark, ruined masonry.[5] A tower, mentioned rather often, may symbolize resistance in conflict,[6] but more frequently a crashing fall. The effect suggests, to a student who has tracked Spenser to his own Buttevant, the winding street with its crumbling ruins, symbol of many a Spenserian incident.[7] We have the capitulation of a fort:

> No fort so fensible, no wals so strong,
> But that continuall battery will rive,
> Or daily siege, through dispurvayaunce long
> And lacke of reskewes, will to parley drive.[8]

Even the Fort of Reason may be reduced to "wrath, gelousie,

and grief,"[9] but maidenhood is impregnable. The bulwark was to him, as it is to us, a symbol of stability.[10]

A devoted reader of Spenser recalls his palaces as among the most delectable structures in fiction. Whatever the House of Pride may owe to Chaucer or Ariosto,[11] the exquisite precision and restraint of the allegory combine astonishingly with gorgeous imagination. Comparable is the description of the throne room of Philotime, which

> was large and wyde,
> As it some gyeld or solemne temple weare:
> Many great golden pillours did upbeare
> The massy roofe, and riches hugh sustayne,
> And every pillour deckëd was full deare
> With crownes, and diadems, and titles vaine,
> Which mortall princes wore, whiles they on earth did rayne.[12]

Pillars, mentioned also elsewhere, typify stability.[13] A striking metaphor likens food and sleep to mighty pillars.[14]

Among lesser structures is the church, whose steeple cast down by lightning typifies Britomart unhorsed in her struggle with Artegall.[15] A peaceful scene is that of a chapel with an ivy-covered roof "like a faire branched grove."[16] A hermit's house is like "a little cage." [17] Before Honour's mansion Sweat keeps her "woefull watches."[18] Death is the "common Inne of rest."[19] The gate as a symbol, a concept living in our own non-figurative age, Spenser uses effectively. The Cave of Morpheus has inner and outer gates of ivory and of silver, beautiful enough (so I interpret) to attract Care and then debar his entrance. Hope is likened to a window.[20] To figures based on architectural structure or adornment must be added the stairway, keys, even the dial which, crowning the House of Pride, suggests ironically the daily course of a normal establishment.

The portraits of Edmund Spenser do not suggest a robust Elizabethan's enjoyment of food and drink. Though probably no ascetic, he draws fewer images from food than from man's other primal necessity, shelter. But the few include admirably definite phrases. Red Cross is in danger of being "pouldred all, as thin as flowre."[21] We could ill spare a remarkable daily scene:

> Like as an huswife, that with busie care
> Thinks of her dairie to make wondrous gaine,

> Finding where-as some wicked beast unware
> That breakes into her dayr' house, there doth draine
> Her creaming pannes, and frustrate all her paine,
> Hath, in some snare or gin set close behind,
> Entrappëd him, and caught into her traine,
> Then thinkes what punishment were best assign'd,
> And thousand deathes deviseth in her vengefull mind.[22]

(One can fancy Sarah Spenser as housekeeper at Kilcolman running to Edmund with bad news from the dairy.) Once milk is unpalatable, as in "the bitter milke of tine."[23] One figure comes from the poultry yard. The Palmer, feeling the pulse of Guyon in a swoon, touches him tenderly "as chicken newly hatched."[24] There are two references to the butcher's stall[25] and one to a hogkilling scene.[26] The figure of fruits in general, still a commonplace, may be dismissed with the mention of a few specific ones, apples and cherries.[27] The Elizabethan fancy for figures based on sugar and honey is illustrated abundantly. A mention of honey and gall of course appears. But a pleasing variant of stock phrases occurs in drops of melting love with ambrosial kisses.[28] The sole mention of a wine press is to that made by the "daintie breach" of Acrasia's fingers, a phrase long admired.[29]

In industrial life nothing so fascinated Spenser as the "fire spitting" forge of the blacksmith.[30] The fancy for this may have dated from childhood, as some memory of a tailor's shop may have called forth Shakspere's vivid passage in *King John*. The great scene of the furnaces in Mammon's Cave has been judged "hardly excelled by any other description of labor."[31] Compare with this the powerful description of the blacksmith, Care,

> With blistred hands emongst the cinders brent,
> And fingers filthie, with long nayles unpared,
> Right fit to rend the food on which he fared.[32]

Spenser frequently sees likenesses of human behavior to qualities of metals. Of such conceptions that of Talus, the Iron Man, is most powerful. Striking expressions are "iron courage," "iron heart," "iron eyes." The "cold iron chains" might be a phrase of Keats. (Incidentally Spenser delights in figures from chains.) The power of women over men is likened to iron chains.[33] Figures are derived from brass and lead also. The trick of the goldsmith's trade occurred to him:

As guilefull goldsmith that, by secret skill,
With golden foyle doth finely over-spred
Some baser metall, which commend he will
Unto the vulgar for good gold insted,
He much more goodly glosse thereon doth shed,
To hide his falshood, then if it were trew:
So hard this idole was to be ared,
That Florimell her selfe in all mens vew
She seem'd to passe: so forgëd things do fairest shew.[34]

Since figures involving gold overflow in Renaissance literature we may expect them in the *Faerie Queene*. They are too stereotyped to be listed. Especially dear to Spenser is the chain of gold signifying concord. In another vein a striking aphorism occurs:

For sure a fool I do him firmly hold
That loves his fetters though they be gold.[35]

Silver, appearing concretely a score of times, is figurative in "silver slumber," "silver sleep." The only reference to copper is to the "wire-like locks of Furor," a phrase admired by Leigh Hunt.[36] With the usual connotations are found figures from marble and glass.

To the work of other artificers may be added that of the mason,[37] the engraver,[38] and the painter.[39]

From occupations which concern women chiefly come metaphors of weaving and knitting, none of unusual force, some only the classic stock phrases of the threads of fate. Arresting, nevertheless, is the scene of the knights in Radigund's power:

Spinning and carding all in comely rew

earning their board and keep by twisting "linen twyne."[40] Distraction is powerfully shown with a distaff,

Upon the which she litle spinnes, but spils,
And faynes to weave false tales and leasings bad,
To throw amongst the good, which others had disprad.[41]

To the distaff may be added the needles, in the comparison of the sharpness of the eyes of the Squire of Low Degree.[42]

Spenser, as a Renaissance gentleman, was necessarily observant of clothing. Some of the finest expressions, however, are concrete, and though charming, like the detail of the Knight and the Ladies in the House of Pride who "pranke their ruffs," do not belong here. Most of the metaphors and

similes are stereotyped; for instance, hair called a mantle. Cloak, hood, veil, shroud (the vesture in Spenser, never the winding sheet) have only the usual significance. Occasional expressions are arresting. The mantle of Venus is "coloured like the starry skyes."[43] The golden aygulets on Belphebe's tunic "glistred bright, like twinckling starres."[44] The bridal vesture of the Medway,

> seem'd like silver, sprinckled here and theare
> With glittering spangs, that did like starres appear.[45]

The satin of Radigund's camis is white as milk.[46] The trappings of Duessa's palfrey are woven "like a wave."[47] From tattered clothing came a fine epithet in reference to Artegall's struggle for justice and the "ragged common weal."[48]

Spenser has enriched his narratives with figures from domestic equipment as well as crafts. (More numerous are those concerning outdoor pastimes, such as archery, hunting, hawking.) These having been treated previously are omitted here, though they belong in the view of a rounded Elizabethan life. We may sketch rightly from the figures the picture of an Elizabethan house. In a courtyard and an adjacent outhouse are the yoke, the flail, the scythe, the sledge, the hammer, the hatchet, the whip and the block—the last too indefinite for genuine localization. In a luxurious interior are the arras, the tapestry, "white silken pillows," the bed, the mirror, the stool. Elsewhere are the cup, "Bacchus' fruit on the silver plate," the knife, and such miscellaneous accessories as the balance, the hourglass, the tablet, the pen. By night are torch, candlelight, or lamp. Behind the house are the potsherd, the laystall, and the dungheap. To unsightly potsherds he likened the helmet and plates of mail hewn to bits.[49] From offal he derived the incomparable epitome of all vulgarity, "the dunghill mind."[50]

An especially effective figure comes from the lamp, in the story of the weakness of Lear when he has "resigned his regiment,"

> But true it is that, when the oyle is spent,
> The light goes out, and weeke is thrown away.[51]

The scene of old Glauce carefully extinguishing the lamp beside the sleeping Britomart, a touch worthy of Chaucer, is literal only, not figurative, but much too charming to be omitted.[52]

In no realm of domestic life does Spenser show more exceptional felicity than in his nursery scenes, frequently admired. Britomart's distress over the news from Talus of Artegall's imprisonment is thus described:

> Like as a wayward childe, whose sounder sleepe
> Is broken with some fearefull dreames affright,
> With froward will doth set him selfe to weepe;
> Ne can be stild for all his nurses might,
> But kicks, and squals, and shrickes for fell despight;
> Now scratching her, and her loose locks misusing;
> Now seeking darkenesse, and now seeking light;
> Then craving sucke, and then the sucke refusing:
> Such was this ladies fit, in her loves fond accusing.[53]

Clarinda in deceiving her mistress, Radigund, is like a

> A bad nurse, which, fayning to receive
> In her owne mouth the food ment for her chyld,
> Witholdes it to her selfe, and doeth deceive
> The infant, so for want of nourture spoyld.[54]

An agreeable, tender picture shows Mercy leading Red Cross over a thorny, briar-grown road to the "hold Hospitall" with a firm hand,

> As carefull nourse her child from falling oft does reare.[55]

A passage of high emotional value likens the joy of Britomart over praise of Artegall to that of a mother over the birth of a babe.[56]

In a broader scope of life Spenser includes the schoolroom, calling "the court and royall Citadell" the great schoolmistress of all courtesy.[57] A library appears in the allegory of Memory:

> His chamber all was hangd about with rolls,
> And old records from auncient times derivd,
> Some made in books, some in long parchment scrolls,
> That were all worm-eaten and full of canker holes.[58]

Inevitably we have the "book of fate," the "eternall booke of fame," the "blot of ill fame."

The great scene of the trial of Duessa before Mercilla takes us to the law courts. A little allegory of Mirabella brought to trial at the Court of Cupid introduces Portamore,

> A baylieffe errant forth in post did passe,
> Whom they by name there Portamore did call;
> He which doth summon lovers to Loves judgement hall.[59]

Divine justice in one of the most powerful scenes, Una's rescue of Red Cross from self-destruction, she personifies as

able to efface the "accurst handwriting of all charges against him."

The art of healing has a place. The Leach in the House of Holiness[60] is Patience. A sufferer may find healing in a rehearsal of his sorrow:

> He oft finds med'cine, who his grief imparts.[62]

In any case, death becomes a sweet medicine to free the "long captived soules from wearie thraldome."[63]

Spenser, as a representative Elizabethan, loves music. The trumpet (if we may classify it as musical) is a prime favorite, used concretely, however, except in the famous,

> For trumpets sterne to chaunge mine oaten weeds.

The horn (not the cornucopia) is conceived as having symbolic power. When sounded by Arthur's Squire, Echo answered it from a distance of three miles.[64] Pain and pleasures intermingled are like the discord in music which "makes the sweeter lay."[65] In a striking stanza Spenser speaks *in propria persona;* at the beginning of Red Cross' combat with the Dragon:

> Fayre goddesse, lay that furious fitt asyde,
> Till I of warres and bloody Mars doe sing,
> And Briton fieldes with Sarazin blood bedyde,
> Twixt that great Faery Queene and Paynim King,
> That with their horror heven and earth did ring,
> And worke of labour long, and endlesse prayse:
> But now a while lett downe that haughtie string,
> And to my tunes thy second tenor rayse,
> That I this man of God his godly armes may blaze.[66]

Despite pervading mention of both vocal and instrumental music and the two combined, the actual figures drawn from this source are scanty. Happily the figures drawn from the theatre and from pageant, if not abundant, are exceptionally strong and suggestive. The reader longs for more, and for free expressions from Spenser of his opinions on the contemporary drama. Clearly his memory of it was vivid, since after 1580 his experiences as an eye witness were extremely limited. Omitting the Vergilian "woods like a theatre," we may begin with the gracious words of Red Cross to Guyon as they part after their brief acquaintance:

> But you, faire sir, whose pageant next ensewes,
> Well mote yee thee, as well can wish your thought.[67]

A reference shortly follows to "sad pageant of men's miseries."[68] Again, not sorrows, but love is the actor in the pageant.[69] As a single pageant in the Procession of the Months, appears "jolly June,"

> All in greene leaves, as he a player were.[70]

The same scene in the theatre motivated a vivid simile in the introductory stanzas of the Maske of Cupid:

> All suddeinly a stormy whirlwind blew
> Throughout the house, that clappëd every dore,
> With which that yron wicket open flew,
> As it with mighty levers had bene tore;
> And forth yssewd, as on the readie flore
> Of some theatre, a grave personage,
> That in his hand a braunch of laurell bore,
> With comely haveour and count'nance sage,
> Yclad in costly garments, fit for tragicke stage.
> Proceeding to the midst, he stil did stand,
> As if in minde he somewhat had to say,
> And to the vulgare beckning with his hand,
> In signe of silence, as to heare a play,
> By lively actions he gan bewray
> Some argument of matter passionëd;
> Which doen, he backe retyrëd soft away,
> And passing by, his name discoverëd,
> Ease, on his robe in golden letters cypherëd.[71]

How, then, did Spenser regard the actual men and women playing their parts upon his "daedal earth?" Of course they were subject to constant changes of destiny, for Fortune has a "headlong wheel."[73] Yet life with its sins, suffering, punishment has superb values. To begin with, few poets have ever felt more devout satisfaction in the physical beauty of man, the paragon of angels. Obliterate all the prolix allegory in the House of Temperance,[75] and Spenser's admiration for the cunning pattern of excelling nature is candid. It matters little if the imagery be derivative and conventional. Conventionality and sincerity are not antithetic. Spenser for the human form uses freely the stock figures for precious metals and jewels, as thoroughly dear to his age as discredited by ours. Hair is universally like golden wire, the teeth like pearls between rubies "laughing sweetly red." Tears are like pearls; even so are the drops of perspiration on Acrasia's breast.[76] Pastorella is like a diamond in "doubtful shadow of the darksome night.[77] Breasts are of crystal and alabaster. The ivory of Britomart's skin "into clear car-

nation sudden dyde."[78] The complexion of Serena asleep in "faire shining ivory."[79] The shoulders of Amphitrite[80] and the breast of Florimell are ivory.[81] Ivory is applied also to the chest and the forehead. The destruction of such beauty, unless it be but a covering for impurity, Spenser gives with terrible force because he felt primarily the sanctity of the Lord's anointed temple. The thought of the mutilation of his own dead body brought out the startlingly personal line:

Ah! dearest God me graunt, I dead not be defould.[82]

Miranda did not surpass Spenser in her

O beauteous world that hath such people in it.

But one has read the *Faerie Queene* in vain unless he has felt on every hand Spenser's exultation of the spiritual beauty of man above all else, his confidence that the pure in heart are of all most blessed because they shall see God and be with him.

(To be Continued)

---

[1]See Heise's *Die Gleichnisse in Edmund Spenser's Faerie Queene und ihre Vorbilder,* Konigsee, 1902, for brief but analytical treatment.

[2]James Lyndon Shanley, *A Study of Spenser's Gentleman,* Evanston, 1940, p. 4.

[3]See "Spenser's Clouded Heaven," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin,* Vol. XI, No. 3; "Imagery of the *Faerie Queene* drawn from Flora and Fauna, *"Ibid.,* Vol XVI, No. 2; "Imagery of Water in the *Faerie Queene," English Literary History,* Vol. VIII, No. 3.

[4]"The tower with its varied associations, its pageantry, and its medieval atmosphere was bound to appeal to the delicate imagination of such a child." Pauline Henley, *Spenser in Ireland,* p. 10.

[5]*FQ.* 2, 7, 13, 8; 3, 8, 37, 6; 1, 2, 20, 2; 3, 1, 31, 32; 5, 8, 9, 9.

[6]*FQ.* 2, 8, 35, 7.

[7]*FQ.* 1, 2, 20, 1-2.

[8]*FQ.* 3, 10, 10, 1-8.

[9]*FQ.* 2, 4, 34, 9.

[10]*FQ.* 5, 10, 35, 4.

[11]*Variorium,* I, 213, 214.

[12]*FQ.* 2, 7, 43, 4-9.

[13]*FQ.* 3, 7, 41, 5; 6, 8, 16, 2-3; 7, 8, 2, 4.

[14]*FQ.* 2, 7, 65, 3-4. See *Variorium,* II, 269 for various sources.

[15]*FQ.* 4, 6, 14.

[16]*FQ.* 6, 5, 35, 1-4.

[17]*FQ.* 6, 5, 38, 3.

[18]*FQ.* 2, 3, 41, 4-5.

[19]*FQ.* 2, 1, 59, 2.

[20]*FQ.* 5, 5, 39, 3. See *Variorium,* V, 205, for comment.

[21]*FQ.* 1, 7, 12, 4. Cf. 2, 4, 24, 2 for Chaucer's "boult it to the brenne." Note also references to a water mill, *FQ.* 1, 11, 22, 6, and 6, 1, 21, 1-5.

[22]*FQ.* 7, 6, 48.

[23]*FQ.* 3, 11, 1, 4.

[24]*FQ.* 2, 8, 9, 8-9.

[25]*FQ.* 1, 5, 49, 2; 6, 12, 30, 8.

[26]*FQ.* 7, 7, 40, 1-3.

[27]See "Imagery of Flora and Fauna," note 3 *supra.*

[28]*FQ.* Proem, IV, 5, 5-7.

[29]*FQ.* 2, 12, 56, 4-5.

[30]*FQ*. 1, 2, 17, 7-8; 1, 11, 42, 5; 4, 4, 23, 5; 4, 5, 38, 9; 5, 5, 7, 6-9.
[31]*FQ*. 2, 7, 35 and 36. See comment of Charles W. Comp, *The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature,* Columbia Press, 1932, p. 51.
[32]*FQ*. 4, 5, 35, 3-6.
[33]*FQ*. 6, 8, 1-4.
[34]*FQ*. 4, 5, 15.
[35]*FQ*. 3, 9, 8, 4-5.
[36]*FQ*. 2, 4, 15, 8; *Variorium,* II, 228.
[37]*FQ*. 3, 8, 37, 6-7.
[38]*FQ*. 5, 6, 2, 6-8.
[39]*FQ*. 1, 9, 49, 6.
[40]*FQ*. 5, 5, 22, 4 and 9.
[41]*FQ*. 5, 12, 36, 6-9.
[42]*FQ*. 4, 8, 39, 1-2.
[43]*FQ*. 3, 1, 36, 2.
[44]*FQ*. 2, 3, 26, 7-8.
[45]*FQ*. 4, 11, 45, 4-5.
[46]*FQ*. 5, 5, 2, 3.
[47]*FQ*. 1, 2, 13, 8.
[48]*FQ*. 5, 12, 26, 4.
[49]*FQ*. 6, 1, 37, 5.
[50]*FQ*. 6, 7, 1, 6.
[51]*FQ*. 2, 10, 30, 1-2.
[52]*FQ*. 3, 2, 47, 8; see *Variorium,* III, 220, for De Selincourt's praise.
[53]*FQ*. 5, 6, 14.
[54]*FQ*. 5, 5, 53, 1-4.
[55]*FQ*. 1, 10, 35, 9.
[56]*FQ*. 3, 2, 11, 6-9.
[57]*FQ*. 3, 6, 1, 6.
[58]*FQ*. II, 9, 57, 6-9.
[59]*FQ*. 6, 7, 35, 7-9.
[60]*FQ*. 1, 10, 23, 7-9.
[61]*FQ*. 1, 2, 34, 4; cf. 4, 6, 1, 5-9.
[62]*FQ*. 3, 3, 5, 5.
[63]*FQ*. 2, 1, 36, 9.
[64]*FQ*. 1, 8, 4, 4; *Variorium,* I, 257; *Chalmers Poets,* Vol. 21, 1810, John Hoole translator of *Orlando Furioso,* XV, 11. 105-6.
[65]*FQ*. 3, 2, 15, 9.
[66]*FQ*. 1, 11, 7, 1-4, 7, 8.
[67]*FQ*. 2, 1, 33, 6.
[68]*FQ*. 2, 1, 36, 3.
[69]*FQ*. 3, 5, 1, 2.
[70]*FQ*. 7, 7, 35, 1-2.
[71]*FQ*. 3, 12, 3 and 4.
[72]*FQ*. 4, 3, 37, 6-9.
[73]*FQ*. 5, 10, 20, 7.
[74]*FQ*. 7, 6, 1.
[75]*FQ*. 2, 9, 22 ff. See *Variorium,* II, 289 f.
[76]*FQ*. 2, 12, 78, 4-5.
[77]*FQ*. 6, 11, 13, 3-4.
[78]*FQ*. 3, 3, 20, 3.
[79]*FQ*. 6, 8, 37, 3.
[80]*FQ*. 4, 11, 11, 7.
[81]*FQ*. 3, 8, 35, 4. See Elmer E. Stoll, *Poets and Playwrights,* University of Michigan Press, 1930, p. 17 ff, for Spenser's "Pre-Raphaelite joy" in the beauty of women. See also Israel Boroway, "Imagery of Spenser and the Song of Songs," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* Vol. 33, 1934, pp. 23-45.
[82]*FQ*. 1, 10, 42, 9.

SHAKSPERE ON DEGREE: A STUDY IN BACKGROUNDS[1]

By PAUL DEUTSCHBERGER

THE politico-religious idea that the inequalities in the estates of man are ordained by nature, since all natural things observe a similar hierarchy of eminence and authority, is expressed by Shakspere in two plays. In *Henry* V, I, ii, Canterbury declares that heaven divides "the state of man in divers functions, . . . to which is fixed . . . obedience," referring in proof to the kingdom of the bees. In *Troilus and Cressida,* I, iii, Ulysses states that inequality, degree, is the law of nature:

> The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre,
> Observe degree, priority, and place,
> Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
> Office, and custom, in all line of order:
> And therefore is the glorious planet Sol
> In noble eminence enthron'd and spher'd
> Amidst the other; whose med'cinable eye
> Corrects the ill aspécts of planets evil,
> . . . but when the planets,
> In evil mixture, to disorder wander,
> What plagues and what portents! what mutiny!
> What raging of the sea! shaking of the earth!
> Commotions in the winds! frights, changes, horrors,
> Divert and crack, rend and deracinate
> The unity and married calm of states
> Quite from their fixture! O, when degree is shak'd,
> Which is the ladder to all high designs,
> The enterprise is sick! . . .
> Then everything includes itself in power,
> Power in will, will into appetite;
> And appetite, an universal wolf,
> So doubly seconded with will and power,
> Must make perforce an universal prey,
> And last eat up himself.

It is obvious, especially after Dr. Ruth Mohl's *The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*[2], that the fundamental concept behind these two speeches was part of the medieval heritage of the sixteenth century. Yet Ulysses' speech deserves special comment because certain scholars have attempted to maintain that its ideas and images belong solely to Shakspere[3], perhaps because Dr. Mohl has offered no clue to the source of Ulysses' astronomical metaphor.

The force of Ulysses' celestial analogy depends somewhat upon the post-Copernican interest in the mechanics of the heavenly bodies, although Shakspere's cosmogeny is here Ptolemaic. This speech draws upon a body of scientific and religious thought, properly medieval, which has become commonplace during the Renaissance. Although references to the heavenly bodies are not uncommon in medieval literature from Boethius on, the use of extended astronomical figures, without reference to mythology or allegory, does not seem to have been widespread in the latter middle ages and early Renaissance before the Pleiade and Marlowe. Discussions of the so-called "heavenly hierarchy" before 1550, in John Scotus, Pico della Mirandola, and John Colet, for instance, generally concern themselves with the orders of angels, cherubim, and seraphim, based upon the distinctions made by Dionysius the Areopagite, and not with the stars and planets. We find this as late as 1635 in Thomas Heywood's *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels*. So erudite a sixteenth-century poet as Du Bartas prided himself, somewhat fallaciously, it is true, on being the first in France to give a poetical description of the firmament[4].

Nevertheless, the germs of Ulysses' imagery can be found throughout medieval literature. There was, for instance, the often quoted "satellite" analogy, dating back at least to the time of Gregory VII, which served as one of the mainstays of political Papistry. This analogy attempted to fix the relative powers of Pope and Emperor in accord with those of the sun and the moon[5].

Nor is Ulysses' picture of the universe, though less godfull, greatly different from Dante's:

> La gloria di Colui, che tutto muove,
> Per l'universo penetra . . .
> . . . Le cose tutte quante
> Hann'ordine tra loro; e questo è forma,
> Che l'universo a Dio fa somiglante.
> Nell'ordine ch'io dico sono accline
> Tutte nature per diversi sorti
> Più al principio loro, e men vicine:
> Ed ora li, come a sito decreto
> Cen porta la virtù di quella corda
> Che cio che scocca, drizzo in segno lieto[6].
> Vedi come da inde si dirama
> L'obliquo cerchio che i pianeti porta
> Per satisfare al mondo che gli chiama.

E se la strada lor non fosse torta,
Molta virtù nel ciel sarebbe invano
E quasi ogni potenzia quaggiù morta:
E se dal dritto più o men lontano
Fosse'l partire, assai non sarebbe manco
E su e giù dell'ordine mondano[7].
(The All-Mover's glory penetrates through the universe, . . .
All things whatsoever observe a mutual order;
and this the form that maketh the universe
like unto God.
In the order of which I speak all things incline,
by diverse lots, more near and less unto their principle:
Nor only the creatures that lack intelligence
doth this bow shoot, but those that have both
intellect and love.
See how thence off brancheth the oblique circle
that beareth the planets to satisfy the world
that calleth on them;
And were their pathway not inclined, much virtue
in heaven were in vain, and dead were almost
every potency on earth;
And if, from the straight course, or more or less
remote were the departure, much were lacking to
the cosmic order below and eke above[8].)

It is unlikely that Shakspere knew this passage, even though Canterbury repeats the bow-string image:

. . . many things, having full reference
To one concent, may work contrariously:
As many arrows, loosëd several ways,
Fly to one mark[9]

yet Ulysses shows us merely Dante's world in disorder.

Dante, like Ulysses, insists upon the interdependence of the terrestrial and astral worlds, but sees God immanent as the unifying factor. During the Renaissance there became manifest a tendency to stress instead the all-pervading influence of Eternal Law (in the sense of Aquinas's "External Law)", the delicate balance and harmony of all creation. This tendency seems to have been buttressed with general concepts from popular astrological thought, and was not rare in English and Continental literatures. We find the idea expressed by Gower:

. . . whan this litel world mistorneth
The grete world al overturneth[10].

Spenser, catching a hint from Du Bellay[11], declares the influence of the stars:

> . . . the heavens revolution
> Is wandred farre from where it first was pight
> And so doth make contrárie constitution
> Of all this lower world, toward his dissolution[12].

Ulysses' speech derives its intensity from this underlying idea of the mutual influence of microcosm and macrocosm; the idea that the entire universe responds to and is unified by a single law or set of laws. This was later to be the intellectual appeal of the law of gravitation.

But our main interest in Ulysses' speech is the use to which this Eternal Law, as revealed by the heavens, is put. We know that with the religious, social, and political upheavals of the Renaissance and Reformation in England, and as an answer to the doctrines of the more liberal thinkers, such as Sir Thomas More, the argument from degree for order and submission to properly constituted authority became one of the commonplaces of sixteenth-century thought, indeed, such a doctrine was then sorely needed[13]. Shakspere had a wealth of readily accessible material on which to draw for the ideas of Ulysses' speech. But, although many similar ideas may be found in medieval and Renaissance political writings, many Shaksperian commentators have been led to think that Ulysses' sentiments are largely Shakspere's own because no text available to Shakspere and exactly paralleling Ulysses' speech has yet been pointed out. Yet, surprisingly enough, such texts have long been in the possession of scholars.

In *Troilus and Cressida* Shakspere is very close to Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531) which went into eight known reprintings by 1590. Professor Mattingly has noted that Elyot, interestingly enough, refers to "witty Ulisses"[14] and emphasizes just those periods of Roman history which were treated by Shakspere[15]. Elyot repeats the ideas of John of Salisbury and Nicholas Cusanus:

> A publike weale is a body lyuing, compacte
> or made of sondry astates and degrees of men[16].

He develops this in the conventional way in a passage which is strongly suggestive of Shakspere's rhetoric:

> Hath nat (God) set degrees and astates in
> all his glorious warkes . . . Behold also that
> God hath put generally in al his creatures,
> begynnyng at the most inferiour or base,

> and assendynge upwarde . . . so that everythynge is ordre and without ordre may be nothyng stable or permanent. And it may not be called ordre, excepte it do contayne in it degrees, high and base, accordynge to the merite or estimation of the thyng that is ordred[17].

Elyot's most convincing parallel with Ulysses' speech is, however:

> . . . ordre: which in things naturall as supernaturall hath euer had such a preeminence, that thereby the uncomprehensible maiestie of God . . . is declared to the blynde inhabitantes of this worlde. More ouer take away ordre from all thynges what shulde than remayne? Certes nothynge finally, except some man wolde imagine eftsones *Chaos*: which of some is expounde a confuse mixture. Also where there is any lacke of ordre nedes must be perpetuall conflicte: and in thynges subiect to Nature nothynge of hym selfe onely may be norisshed; but when he hath destroyed that where with he doth participate by the ordre of his creation, he hym selfe of necessite must than perisshe, whereof ensueth uniuersall dissolution[18].

Ket's Rebellion (1547) prompted many political treatises expatiating upon civil order, and threatening universal ruin if degree were not observed. The ideas later to be expressed by Ulysses had by this time found their way into the popular sermons of the time. Though these ideas had previously been developed by such men as Tyndal[19] and Barnes[20], and though the doctrine of submission to temporal authority had become an essential part of Protestant dogma with Luther[21], Melancthon[22], and Calvin[23], we find it best expressed in the Tudor period in the *Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates,* 1547. There is one passage in this homily that has much in common with Ulysses' speech, even as to rhetorical tricks and turns of phrase. It concludes, as does Ulysses' speech, that the neglect of degree does not lead to the destruction of small numbers of individuals alone, but:

> . . . where there is no right order, there reigneth all abuse, carnal liberty, enormity, sin, and Babylonical confusion. Take away kings, princes, rulers, magistrates, judges, and such estates of God's order, no man shall go by the highway un-

> robbed; no man shall sleep in his own house or bed unkilled; no man shall keep his wife, children, and possessions in quietness; all things shall be in common; and there must needs follow all mischief and utter destruction both of souls, bodies, goods, and commonwealths[24].

The most important of the tracts occasioned by the civil disorders of the 1540's is Sir John Cheke's *The True Subiect to the Rebell, Or the Hurt of Sedition,* 1549. Many of the arguments advanced by Cheke are repeated by Shakspere. That this pamphlet continued to be known for more than a century after its original publication, and that it continued to be considered more than an excoriation of Ket, the official summary of the Tudor and Stuart attitude toward insurrection, are proved by its reprinting in 1641, during the threat of a Puritan uprising.

Not only, then, was it probably known to Shakspere, but the later use to which it was generally put affords us an important clue to the development of the argument from degree. Especially during and after the Martin Marprelate controversy, this argument was turned full-blast upon the Puritans, and may be found in such works as Thomas Cooper's, Bishop of Winchester, *Admonition to the People of England*[25]. But of all the anti-Puritan works of the Elizabethan period the most important for our study is Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie,* I-IV, 1593. Ulysses' speech seems, indeed, a mere echo of Hooker's exposition of the Law of Nature, wherein we find the astronomical analogy already fully expressed:

> Wherefore to come to the law of nature: albeit thereby we sometimes mean that manner of working that God hath set for each created thing to keep: . . . the heavens and the elements of the world, which can do no otherwise than they do; . . . their strict keeping of one tenure, statute and law, is spoken of by all; . . . God did then institute a law natural to be observed by creatures . . . His commanding those things to be which they are, and to be in such sort as they are, to keep that tenure and course which they do, importeth the establishment of nature's law . . . Now if nature should intermit her course, and leave altogether though it were for a while the observation of her own laws; if those principal and mother elements of the world, whereof all things in this lower world, should lose the qualities which they now have; if the frame of that heavenly arch over our heads should loosen and dissolve itself; if celestial spheres should forget their wonted motions, and by irregular volubility turn themselves any way as it might

> happen; if the prince of the lights of heaven, which now as a giant doth run his unwearied course, should as it were through a languishing faintness begin to stand and rest himself; if the moon should wander from her beaten way, the times and seasons of the year blend themselves by disordered and confused mixture, the winds breathe out their last gasp, the clouds yield no rain, the earth be defeated of heavenly influence, the fruits of the earth pine away as children at the withered breasts of their mother no longer able to yield them relief: what would become of man himself, whom these things now do all serve? See we not plainly that obedience of creatures unto the law of nature is the stay of the world[26].

There are two other points that indicate that Shakspere may have been familiar with Hooker's work when he wrote *Troilus and Cressida.* For one, we need not seek in Alberico Gentili's *De Jure Belli Libri Tres,* 1596, the source of Hector's "These moral laws Of nature and of nations[27]," as Porfessor O. J. Campbell suggests[28]. There is absolutely nothing else in Shakspere to suggest that he was at all familiar with the work of Gentili; there is, however, a full discussion of the law of nations in Hooker[29].

Finally, Ulysses' speech concludes with a reference to "appetite, an universal wolf," seconded by will. It is obvious from Dante[30] and from many other sources that the wolf was a general symbol of the sins of the flesh, lust and avarice. But Ulysses' remark takes on greater intensity in the light of Hooker's analysis of the will in its relation to appetite[31]. Hooker rejects the idea that "the will of man (is) inwardly obstinate, rebellious, and adverse from all obedience unto the sacred laws of his nature[32]." Will, we are told, cannot desire anything evil, but neither can it act, for "Appetite causeth action[33]." Since "Appetite is the Will's solicitor, and the Will is Appetite's controller[34]," Ulysses declares that when degree is neglected, even the will becomes perverse. Appetite is not checked but rather spurred on by will. Man himself then becomes "an universal wolf."

The puzzling part of the whole speech is that the mere matter of Achilles' sulking would seem hardly to demand so vehement a sermon from Ulysses. It may be suggested that while Shakspere was writing Ulysses's speech he allowed himelf to be carried along by a conventional progression of ideas, perhaps suggested to him by Hooker, Elyot, or Cheke, or all together, and which more or less fitted the occasion.

The result was more than a condemnation of Achilles. It was a capital piece of royalist propaganda based upon the same propositions which were then being enunciated by all the government's apologists; unless, a view that is much more likely, considering the nature of the play as a whole, its ineptness was intended to harmonize with and emphasize the satire inherent in Shakspere's delineation of the voluble and ineffective grandiloquence of the Greeks.

Long Island University.

---

[1]The author wishes to thank Professor G. S. Mattingly of Long Island University for so generously contributing both time and material to make this paper possible.

[2]Thesis, Columbia University, 1933.

[3]*V.*, R. W. Chambers in *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More*, Pollard, *et al.*, 1923:

[4]*Creation du Monde, Première Sepmaine, Second Jour*, 11. 386-7, *The Works of Du Bartas*, ed. Holmes, Lyons, Tinker, II, 1938, p. 236.

[5]Friedburg, *Die Mittelalterlichen Lehren Uber das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche*, 1874, I, p.6, n.4.

[6]*Paradiso*, I, 11. 1-2, 103-4, 109-110, 124-6.

[7]*Paradiso*, X, 13-21.

[8]*Temple Classics* ed.

[9]*Henry V*, I, ii.

[10]*Confessio Amantis*, Prologus 957-8; *Works*, Macauley, ed., II, 1901, p. 31.

[11]"Les Antiquités de Rome," *Poésies*, Longnon, ed., 1926, stanza 9, p. 160; stanza 22, p. 168. Cf. Spenser's translation in "Ruines of Rome" stanzas 9 and 22.

[12]*F.Q.*, V, i, 4.

[13]Allen, *History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, 1928, p. 121.

[14]Everyman ed., p. 12.

[15]Private communication from G. S. Mattingly.

[16]*op. cit.*, p. 1.

[17]*ibid.*, p. 3-4.

[18]*ibid.*, p. 3.

[19]*The Fathers of the English Church*, 1807, "On The Obedience of Subjects to Kings, Princes, and Rulers," p. 171-179.

[20]ibid, p. 554-636, *passim*.

[21]*E.g.*, *An den Christlichen Adel.*

[22]*E.g.*, *Disputationes de Rebus Politicis.*

[23]*E.g.*, *Institutio*, (ed. Lefranc), p. 774 *et passim*.

[24]*Homilies*, Griffiths, ed., 1859.

[25]1589, Arber Repr., 1883.

[26]Everyman ed., Bk. I iii, 2, p. 155.

[27]*Troilus and Cressida*, II, ii.

[28]*Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida*, 1938, p. 192.

[29]*op. cit.*, Bk. I, ix, 12, p. 198.

[30]*Inferno*, VII, 8, and *Purgatorio*, XX, 10.

[31]*op. cit.*, Bk. I, vi, p. 169-174.

[32]*ibid.*, Bk. I, x, I, p. 188.

[33]*ibid.*, Bk. I, viii, 3, p. 170.

[34]*ibid.*, *idem*.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

By S. A. T.

SHAKSPERE IN CLEVELAND

The citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, have just cause to be proud of themselves. They give more tangible evidence of their love for the immortal English bard than any other city (we dare say) in the world. In their charming Rockefeller Park they have for several years past, at the suggestion of Leo Weidenthal, been developing a score of beautifully conceived and laid out plots of varying sizes and designs named for as many nationalities and peoples. The architectural, floral, and decorative features of each, including tablets (Maimonides, Spinoza, etc.), statues (Goethe, Schiller, etc.), gates and fountains, are representative of the country or people designated and symbolized. These Cultural Gardens, as they have been appropriately named, represent America, Russia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia, Syria, Ukrania, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Scotland, Scandinavia, Wales, Hungary, Ireland, as well as the lands of the lunatic and degenerate Hitler and the stercoral Mussolini; the land of the perfidious monkey of the Pacific is fortunately and appropriately unrepresented. Then—the lovelist of all—there is, standing all by itself, almost directly opposite the Hebrew Garden (laid out in the shape of a six-pointed star), on a plot measuring about 225 x 350 feet, the Shakspere Garden.

The Shakspere Garden proper is a rectangular area (about 110 x 175 feet) in which are grown, in nicely designed plots, beautiful specimens of the flowers mentioned in the bard's plays and poems; comfortably wide paths between the many beds permit the visitor to inspect every little flower grown in this charming atmosphere. A bronze tablet with an appropriate quotation from Austin Dobson deters the worshiper from plucking a flower or mutilating a tree. At the upper end of the Garden, in a semi-circular area in which stands, just behind a small rectangular pool, is a bust of the poet unveiled in 1916; seats on either side give the visitor an opportunity to relax and think. To the left of the bust, about 65 feet away, is a tree planted from a graft of the original Shakspere mulberry tree in New Place yard.

At the entrance to the flower beds are, one on each side, two beautiful elm trees, one planted by E. H. Sothern and the other by Julia Marlowe; at the upper end of this area, near and in front of the bust, are two lovely willow trees, one planted by William Faversham and the other by Daniel Frohman. (No beastly race-prejudice here!) To the left of the flower beds, midway between the north and the south ends, in a rounded plot, is a sun-dial presented and dedicated by Robert Mantell; directly opposite this, on the right, is a circular bed of ivy and roses from Juliet's tomb. Between the Sothern elm and the sun-dial stands a huge oak tree planted by David Belasco; between the sun-dial and the mulberry tree, off to the left, is a maple tree planted by Miss Effie Ellsler, Cleveland's charming Shaksperian actress. To the right of Juliet's roses is a small group of trees grown from the last two trees left of Birnam wood! Miss Jane Cowl is represented by an elm tree.

We have seen nothing more impressive or more lovely on our recent trip to the middle west of our beautiful country. And our delight was heightened by having for our guide one of Cleveland's most artistic, enthusiastic and well-informed citizens and teachers —Miss Ada Beckwith. For permission to see and describe the plan of the Garden we are indebted to the Commissioner of Parks of the beautiful city of Cleveland.